

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are currently pending. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are independent. Claims 1, 7 and 8-12 are amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,152 to Konuma et al. (hereinafter, merely "Konuma"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“calculation means to calculate the score of a word sequence for each candidate for the unknown word in the word sequence by using the extracted features on the basis of the unknown word dictionary area in which unknown-word-forming elements are stored, said elements forming a speech recognition result corresponding to an unknown word, and for classifying said speech recognition result by an attribute thereof.”

As understood by the Applicants, Konuma discloses an apparatus for recognizing commands for operating a device such as a television. Konuma takes advantage of the limited utterances that need to be in the word recognition dictionary to increase the probability of recognizing an utterance from a user. Konuma calculates a score for an unknown input word. The scores for each possible word that might be the unknown word are arranged in order and the highest-scoring word is recognized as the unknown word. Col. 7, line 49 to col. 8, line 1.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “calculation means to calculate the score of a word sequence for each candidate for the unknown word in the word sequence by using the extracted features on the basis of the unknown word dictionary area in which unknown-word-forming elements are stored, said elements forming a speech recognition result corresponding to an unknown word, and for classifying said speech recognition result by an attribute thereof.” Thus, in the present application, a score for a sequence of input words is calculated. A score for the sequence of words is calculated using each candidate for an unknown word in the word sequence. Each candidate for the word sequence is selected by using extracted features on the basis of the unknown word dictionary and as further claimed.

The sequence of words that likely represents the actual input speech is selected based upon the calculated score for word sequence having each candidate for the unknown word.

Claim 1 is patentable over Konuma because that reference does not disclose each and every element recited in the claim. In particular, Konuma does not disclose, “calculation means to calculate the score of a word sequence for each candidate for the unknown word in the word sequence by using the extracted features on the basis of the unknown word dictionary area in which unknown-word-forming elements are stored” as recited in claim 1.

For reasons similar or somewhat similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 7 and 8 are also believed to be patentable.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-4 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Konuma in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,888 to Kanevsky et al. (hereinafter, merely “Kanevsky”).

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Konuma in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,771 to Muthusamy et al. (hereinafter, merely “Muthusamy”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Neither Kanevsky nor Muthusamy disclose the element missing from Konuma as described above in regards to independent claims 1, 7 and 8. Claims 2-5 and 9-12 depend from one of claims 1, 7 and 8 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION


Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Levy', written over a horizontal line.

By: _____

Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800